## Comment/Question

RFP Section - L.16 Subfactor C. Page RFP Page # 130

RFP Statement – (b) Commitment to the Small Business Program

It is or understanding that section (a) Small Business Subcontracting under Subfactor C is included in the Small Business Subcontracting Plan and is excluded from the 75 page limit. Please confirm that the response to paragraph (b) Commitment to the Small Business Program in the Subfactor C response is within the 75 page limit of the Mission Suitability Volume.

Response

Yes. The response to paragraph (b) Commitment to the Small Business Program in the Subfactor C response is within the 75 page limit of the Mission Suitability Volume. L.14 (b) PROPOSAL CONTENT AND PAGE LIMITATIONS. (1)

covers (b) Commitment to the Small Business Program in Subfactor C.

RFP Section L.18 (a), M.5 RFP Page # 140 and 159

RFP Statement

- For the purposes of the Past Performance Volume, a proposed significant subcontractor is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost of \$2M.

A proposed significant subcontractor for this procurements is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$1M

There is a discrepancy between Sections L&M in the amount of average annual/cost fee (\$1M vs. \$2M) used to determine whether a subcontractor is "significant" in the Past Performance volume. Please clarify which definition stands.

The definition of a proposed significant subcontractor for this procurement is correctly stated in Section L.18.

An amendment will be made to the corresponding definition in Section M.5 to correct the definition of a proposed significant subcontractor for this procurement and will be stated as follows in **M.5 PAST** 

## PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FACTOR (MAR 2012):

A proposed significant subcontractor for this procurement is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an **average annual cost/fee of \$2M.** Note, the definition of significant subcontractor for the past performance evaluation may be different than for the cost evaluation.